DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 458 CS 505 221

AUTHOR Villaume, William A.; Cegala, Donald J.
TITLE Implications of Discourse Strategy for Listening.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Listening Association (7th, San Diego, CA, March 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attention; *Behavior Patterns; Discourse Analysis; Interaction; Interpersonal Communication; *Listening Comprehension Tests; *Listening Habits; Listening Skills; *Models; Recall (Psychology); *Research Methodology; *Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

Recognizing the lack of research delineating what personality traits might predispose a person to poor listening, this paper contrasts two lines of research assessing how the cognitive and affective characteristics of speakers impact on their recall of conversation. The first section of the paper considers the theoretical perspective arguing that poor conversational recall is a result of excessive self-focus and inattention to the interlocutor in conversation, and that the research methodology involved directly parallels the methodology normally used in the lecture retention model of traditional listening research. The second section of the paper develops a theoretical perspective derived from close analysis of the conversational text to reveal strategies used by the speakers in conversation. Specifically, it argues that poor conversational recall is based not on excessive self-focus, but on type of orientation to conversational text and the interaction mode of the conversation. The final sections of the paper develop a typology of listeners in conversation using the two interactive variables associated with interaction involvement--discourse orientation (meaning based vs. text based) and interpersonal stance (independent vs. dependent). (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED267458

IMPLICATIONS OF DISCOURSE STRATEGY FOR LISTENING

By

William A. Villaume
Donald J. Cegala

A paper presented at
The Annual Convention of
The International Listening Association
March 13-16, 1986
San Diego, California

William A. Villaume (Ph.D., The Ohio State University, 1984) is an assistant professor of speech communication at Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. Donald J. Cegala (Ph.D., Florida State University, 1972) is a professor of communication at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. The authors wish to thank the following research assistants: Claire Brunner, Sue Branco, Ivan Emke, Philip Pointer, and Brad Shramek.

CS 505221

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William A. Villaume

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

In this paper it is argued that the convergence of research in social cognition and discourse analysis offers an alternative paradigm for the study of listening in conversation. The potential for this paradigm is illustrated by a line of research in interaction involvement hypothesizing that the poor conversational behavior of low involved conversants is grounded in excessive self-focus and lack of attention to the interlocutor. On the basis of discourse analysis it is shown that low involved subjects paid more attention to their interlocutor in conversation but did so using a dependent text-based conversational strategy. It is demonstrated that conversational recall is better accounted for by variables associated with the nature of the nature of the interaction during conversation than by excessive self-focus of one speaker. Finally, a typology of types of listeners in conversation is developed using the two interactive variables associated with interaction involvement, namely, discourse orientation (meaning based vs. text based) and interpersonal stance (independent vs. dependent).

IMPLICATIONS OF DISCOURSE STRATEGY FOR LISTENING

Listening research has been primarily marked by the lecture retention model focusing on the one to many communicative setting. Given that listening in the classroom provided the initial impetus for listening research, such a model is understandable. Much of the research effort has been characterized by the inherent limitations of this model. Because the listener does not show much overt behavior in the one to many setting, researchers have had to develop listening tests in order to study the process of listening. However, such listening tests have received considerable criticism because they rely on stimulus texts relatively removed from the real motives and rich context characteristic of actual communication.

Attempts to expand listening research into the interpersonal setting have not generally transcended the lecture retention model. It has been assumed that research in interpersonal listening requires modification of listening tests. Thus, the tests have been recorded with more attention to paralanguage cues of emotion or with the incorporation of simulated dialogues as stimulus items.

The research results have isolated a series of mistakes often made in poor listening. These mistakes are modelled as "habits" which can be corrected with proper training. Beyond these poor listening habits there have been few advances in what constitutes listening on the levels of sensation, interpretation, evaluation, and response. Especially lacking has been research delineating what personality characteristics might predispose a person to poor listening. Further it has not been determined how such trait-like characteristics impair effective listening.

This paper will attempt to indicate an alternative model for research in interpersonal listening. Instead of delineating this model in general terms, the paper will trace some empirical research illustrating the model in action. Specifically, the paper will consider how interaction involvement as a trait-like personality characteristic (Cegala, 1984; Cegala et al., 1982) impacts upon conversational behavior. Close attention to the utterances produced in conversation by high and low involved speakers will be shown to surface two variables affecting how people listen in conversation. Finally, types of listeners in conversation will be systematically analyzed in terms of these two variables.

Discourse analysis as listening research

Within the last fifteen years there has been a quiet revolution in communication research. Some scholars have become interested in how social cognition interacts with communication behavior. For example, Delia and associates (cf. Delia, 1984) have moved beyond person perception per se to show how cognitive complexity about people affects actual communicative behavior. At the same time, other scholars have focused on delineating and explaining the structural and functional complexities of conversation (cf. McLaughlin, 1984). Much of this research concerns the processes undergirding the establishment of coherence in conversation (cf. Craig & Tracy, 1983). Unlike much research in speech communication, the primary research emphasis has been upon how the listener hears a conversational contribution as being coherent. What little research there is on the speaker has flowed from the speaker's anticipation of how the interlocutor may hear a possible utterance (e.g., Ragan, 1983).

Recently, these two lines of research have merged as scholars have started to ask what forms of social cognitive processing are required to participate fluently and effectively in a coherent conversation. This paper argues that such research constitutes listening research under a different rubric. The model implicit in such research allows for a more valid and heuristic investigation of how listening operates in the interpersonal setting. Typically the

research methodology employed sets subjects into some experimental situation where they are asked to engage in conversation. Sometimes a structured background scenario with specified roles and goals is provided. Sometimes the subjects are left to converse as they will. The conversational interaction is usually video or audio taped. After transcription, the conversational text is coded for some facet of the interaction. Results from various pretest or posttest instruments are analyzed for a significant relationship with the coded conversational behavior.

There are several advantages to such a method of investigating how listening functions within conversation:

1. Listening is occurring in an interactive setting where the participants have goals guiding their behavior.
2. The subjects have the opportunity to respond immediately to what they have heard. Each conversational contribution operates as evidence of how a speaker has been listening to prior portions of the conversation.
3. Listening can be investigated in a richer situational context with varied constraints.
4. The function of inferencing within the process of listening can be more easily investigated as subjects utilize situational information to process conversational utterances (cf. Housel, 1984).
5. Listening is closely aligned with speaking in actual interaction.
6. Characteristic strategies in interpersonal listening can be delineated along with the effect such strategies have on speaking and vice versa.

Because of such advantages, this research approach offers a better way to investigate interpersonal listening. Many of the disadvantages of listening tests are avoided. Furthermore, the conclusions coming from a one to one research model are more valid for the interpersonal settings in organizations which listening consultants wish to address.

The following two sections of the paper will contrast two lines of research assessing how the cognitive and affective characteristics of speakers impact on their recall of conversation. The

first section will consider the theoretical perspective arguing that poor conversational recall is a result of excessive self-focus and inattention to the interlocutor in conversation. The research methodology involved directly parallels the methodology normally used in the lecture retention model of traditional listening research. The conversation is treated as a stimulus text which the subjects are requested to recall. The interactive development of the conversation is essentially ignored with conclusions drawn from the recall data alone. The second section will develop a theoretical perspective derived from close analysis of the conversational text to reveal strategies employed by the speakers in conversation. Specifically, it will be argued that poor conversational recall is not based on excessive self-focus. Instead conversational recall will be accounted for by two variables associated with discourse strategy, namely, type of orientation to conversational text, and the interaction mode of the conversation. The conclusion of this alternative perspective strongly implies that listening behavior is closely coordinated with speaking strategies in conversation.

The final sections of the paper will explore the implications of discourse strategy for listening research. As an illustration of the heuristic value of this model for researching interpersonal listening, the two variables associated with discourse strategy will be used to systematize an analysis of types of listeners in conversation.

Research in conversational recall:
Listening divorced from speaking

Excessive self-focus and recall of conversation

It has often been assumed that poor conversants are self-focused and do not attend to their interlocutor. Consequently they may find it difficult to participate in a coordinated coherent conversation. It is speculated that such conversants may be preoccupied with their own concerns or focusing on negative affect such as apprehension or anxiety (Cegala, 1984). In any case, coherent participation in conversation requires considerable awareness of one's interlo-

cutor and attentive tracking of what they have been contributing to the conversation. Good conversation requires good listening.

Recent work in psychology (cf. Bell, 1985) argues that poor attentiveness may not only lead to problems in conversation but also to serious relational consequences. For example, Bell (1985) contends that chronic loneliness may result from poor conversational behavior grounded in excessive self-focus. Thus, effective therapy for chronically lonely people may need to assist them in focusing more on their interlocutor and listening better during conversation.

Experimental verification of this self-focus theory has often used recall of conversation as an indicator of self-focus during conversation. Typically, subjects are placed in an unstructured conversation with a stranger in an experimental setting. The conversation is recorded for later transcription. After the finish of the conversation the subjects are requested to recall in written format what was said in the conversation by the interlocutor and by themselves. These memory protocols are coded for the degree of detail remembered about conversational contributions by self and other.

In a study of the conversational differences between lonely and nonlonely individuals, Bell (1985) utilized coding procedures developed by Stafford and Daly (1984) for comparing recall data with the conversational transcript. Thus, Bell (1985) was able to compute an index of attention to other expressed as the percentage of thought units expressed by the other in conversation that were recalled by the subject. A similar ratio was computed for attention to self. Bell (1985) found that lonely subjects had significantly lower scores for attention to other than nonlonely subjects. However, there was no significant difference for attention to self. Additionally, Bell found that there was no significant difference in recall inaccuracy for lonely and nonlonely subjects. Although it was not evident that lonely people are more self-focused, Bell concluded that lonely people do seem to be less attentive to their interlocutor than nonlonely people. A listening researcher might well have concluded that lonely people listen less to their interlocutor than nonlonely people.

In an ongoing program of research (Cegala et al., 1982; Cegala, 1984), Cegala has developed the construct of interaction involvement, which is defined as a person's characteristic degree of involvement in conversation. High involved individuals are able to focus their attention on self, other, and the emerging flow of conversation. They integrate their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors into the evolving interaction with others. Low involved individuals, on the other hand, typically are psychologically and communicatively removed from conversation. They often appear withdrawn, preoccupied, and distracted in the course of talking with someone else.

In a study of the conversational behavior associated with interaction involvement (Cegala, 1984), 120 subjects were paired in 60 unstructured conversations of six minutes in length. The conversations conformed to one of three dyadtypes: two high involved speakers (H-H), two low involved speakers (L-L), one high involved speaker and one low involved speaker (H-L). Memory protocols were obtained after the end of the conversation for 1) what the partner talked about during the conversation, and 2) what the subject him/herself talked about during the conversation. These protocols were coded into thought units focusing on a single topic. A second level of coding distinguished thought units expressing only a single fact and thought units expressing multiple facts. No multiple fact thought units were obtained for recall of self. The results indicated that high involved subjects recalled significantly more multiple fact thought units about the other's talk than did the low involved subjects. No significant difference was obtained for recall of self. One unanticipated result was a significant main effect for dyadtype. The H-L dyads recalled more single fact thought units of self and more single fact thought units of other. In another facet of the experiment, Cegala (1984) found that the low involved subjects reported significantly more negative affect (fear/anxiety) during the conversation. Conversely, the high involved subjects reported significantly more positive emotions (positive/friendly, proud/strong) during the conversation. Cegala (1984) concluded that low involved conversants focus on their negative emotionality. Consequently their attention to their interlocutor suffers during conversation. In addition, he noted that there seemed to be an interactive factor insofar

as the dyadtype had a significant effect on the conversational recall. However, it was the H-L dyadtype that showed more extensive recall of the conversation than the H-H dyadtype as would be expected on the basis of the theory of excessive self-focus.

Bell (1985) and Cegala (1984) obtained roughly similar results for recall of conversation. Such a similarity would be expected insofar as Bell and Daly (1985) found that loneliness was negatively and significantly correlated with two of the three factors of interaction involvement, namely responsiveness (-.37) and attentiveness (-.18). Both studies found no direct evidence of greater recall of self by either lonely subjects or low involved subjects. However, they did find evidence that nonlonely subjects and high involved subjects recalled more of the interlocutor's talk than lonely subjects and low involved subjects. Both studies concluded that such results indicated greater attentiveness to other. Such results, though, are weak support for the theory of excessive self-focus. The following section will develop an alternative approach to conversational recall which is more consonant with the recall data just discussed.

An alternative approach to conversational recall:

Listening coordinated with speaking

This section will examine research on the strategies of high and low involved speakers in conversation. From a finely grained analysis of their utterances it will be shown that the orientation of a speaker to conversational text (text-based vs. meaning-based) and the type of interaction (complementary vs. symmetrical) offer an alternative explanation for poor conversational recall.

Conversational strategy

As a part of the larger experiment by Cegala (1984), Villaume (1984) examined the explicit development of content in thirty of the sixty conversations mentioned above. The transcripts of these conversations were unitized into thought units. All cohesive devices (such as pronouns, demonstratives, and ellipses) were interpreted to provide a fully explicit text. For example, "He took her to the movies" might be fully interpreted as "John took Mary to the movies." Patterns in the distribution of content words across utterances were examined using Hasan's (1984) Cohesive Harmony Index. Basically, ratios were computed for how much of the content of a current thought unit was previously manifested in an explicit fashion either 1) in the same thought unit, or 2) in a prior thought unit of the same speaker, or 3) in a prior though unit of the other speaker. The ratios obtained were summed across speakers to produce scores for the whole conversation, thus allowing the conversation to serve as the unit of analysis. It was expected that such a procedure would better delineate the interactive effect of dyadtype as noted in Cegala (1984).

Given the conceptualization of low involved individuals as more self-focused and less attentive to the interlocutor, it was hypothesized that there would be significant differences among dyadtypes for the proportion of interactive content (i.e., content last explicitly expressed in a prior thought unit of the interlocutor) such that H-H > H-L > L-L. The results indicated

that the L-L dyadtype showed significantly greater interactive content than the H-H and H-L dyadtypes. Additionally, there was no significant difference among dyadtypes in the amount of content last explicitly expressed in a prior thought unit of self. Finally, the H-L dyadtype showed significantly greater syntactic complexity for its thought units than the L-L dyadtype.

The results were further clarified in a multivariate discriminant analysis of the data. Dyadtype was clearly discriminated by two discriminant functions. The first function indicated that if a low involved speaker was present in the conversation, there was greater interactive sharing of explicit content in the conversation. The second function established that if a high involved speaker was present in the conversation, there was less interactive sharing of content and greater syntactic complexity within thought units. This analysis, then, presents evidence inconsistent with the self-focus hypothesis. In regard to the explicit content of their utterances, low involved speakers show more evidence of attention paid to the utterances of their interlocutor (Villaume, 1984). Similarly, in their investigation of chronic loneliness Bell and Daly (1985) found that subjects' scores on the UCLA Loneliness scale were significantly and positively correlated (+.18) with the other-directed subscale of Snyder's Self-monitoring scale. Such results indicate that low involved subjects and lonely subjects are more focused on the interlocutor than on self. If such is the case, why do they show poorer recall of the interlocutor's utterances? In the following section it will be argued that the crucial difference lies not in the focus of attention but in the mode of attention and interpersonal stance taken as part of the subjects' conversational strategy.

Mode of attention in conversation

In order to create coherent conversation, speakers have to create ties among utterances. Some of these ties are on the pragmatic level and are not explicitly marked. Frequently though, speakers use explicit cohesive devices on the grammatical level to mark the presence of ties between utterances. Thus extended conversation normally shows heavy usage of reference

devices such as pronouns (he, she, they) and demonstratives (this, that). Clear usage of reference devices requires the speaker to anticipate how the interlocutor will interpret the pronoun or demonstrative. Such anticipation is based on considerable skills in social perspective taking. Other grammatical cohesive devices such as ellipsis or substitution are not so much based on patterns of meaning but on prior segments of surface text. In substitution, for example, marker words such as one or do so instruct the interlocutor to insert a segment of surface text from a prior (usually immediately preceding) utterance. In ellipsis there is no marker word; the obvious absence of required grammatical functions signals the listener to insert a stretch of surface text from the antecedent utterance. Such text-based cohesive devices have a reduced cognitive burden for the speaker. Thus if a speaker is not certain of how the interlocutor may construe the meaning of one's utterances and finds the social perspective taking behind the use of reference devices somewhat problematic, the speaker can resort to the increased usage of text-based cohesive devices to create ties within conversation.

In an analysis of the same conversations studied in Villaume (1984), Villaume and Cegala (1986) found that there were different conversational strategies utilized by high and low involved subjects to create ties within conversation. Low involved subjects used significantly more text-based cohesive devices (ellipses) to tie to the utterances of the interlocutor. On the other hand, high involved subjects used significantly more meaning-based cohesive devices (various forms of reference) to tie within their current utterance.

When the conversations were used as the unit of analysis, a clear pattern emerged from a discriminant analysis applied to the data on cohesive devices. Two functions were found to discriminate the dyadtypes with a classification accuracy of 100%. One function indicated that when a low involved speaker was present in the conversation there were more text-based ties to the other speaker. The other function discriminated the complementary interaction of the H-L dyadtype from the symmetrical interaction of the H-H or L-L dyadtypes. When the more independent meaning-based strategy of a high involved speaker was joined by the more dependent

text-based strategy of a low involved speaker, the conversation flowed along smoothly. On the other hand, when two low involved speakers were both trying to tie back to each other's surface text, a symmetrical interaction emerged marked by less development of content. Similarly, the development of content in a H-H dyad was constrained by each speaker having to take account of the independent concerns of the other speaker. Such an interactive analysis is concordant with the work of Cegala, Wall, and Rippey (1986) who found that high involved speakers are relatively more independent and goal-oriented than low involved speakers.

In summary, then, analysis of the conversational text of high and low involved speakers has surfaced two variables differentiating their participation in conversation. The following section will develop how these two variables -- orientation to discourse, and interpersonal stance -- are related to conversational listening and recall.

Implications of text-based discourse strategy for listening

The above studies indicate that speakers with a text-based discourse strategy focus more on the specific words uttered by the interlocutor rather than on the underlying patterns of meaning. Insofar as specific text tends to fade from short term memory rather quickly, speakers with a text-based discourse strategy tend to tie back to the immediately prior utterance of the interlocutor and never attempt more comprehensive integration of the interlocutor's train of talk. Thus text-based discourse strategy is marked by less depth of cognitive processing and by less active engagement with the meaning of the interlocutor.

In support of this conclusion, depth of cognitive processing has been found to be significantly related to recall (Anderson, 1983; Craik, 1973; Craik & Lockhart, 1972). Similarly, listening researchers such as Steil, Barker, & Watson (1983) note that one prominent mistake in listening is to focus on the specific words of the text rather than listening for meaning. Thus it would not be expected that subjects with a text-based conversational strategy for tying to their interlocutor should recall as much of the conversational contributions of the interlocutor as

subjects with a meaning-based conversational strategy. Secondly, subjects with a text-based conversational strategy would be expected to recall more single fact thought units of the interlocutor than multiple fact thought units. Finally, this theoretical account would not predict that subjects with text-based strategies would show greater degree of self-focus manifested as more recall of self than recall of other. In other words, the mode of attention in conversation may be as important to conversational recall as the degree of attention and the focus of attention. If anything, low involved subjects tend to focus more on their interlocutor than high involved subjects but do so in a text-based manner.

Conversational recall and text-based strategy

As a partial test of the hypothesis that poor conversational recall is significantly related to dependent text-based conversational strategies, a discriminant analysis was performed on the recall data for the 30 conversations analyzed in Villaume and Cegala (1986). It was expected that the discriminant structure obtained for the recall data would coincide with the discriminant structure obtained for the conversational strategy data. Specifically it was expected that one function should be based on the presence of a low involved speaker and the other function should reflect the difference between complementary and symmetrical interaction in the conversations.

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3 here

Table 1 presents the summary statistics for the two discriminant functions obtained. The first was significant at the .05 level and the second at the .10 level. It was decided to interpret both functions because of the small sample size and the amount of variance accounted for (37% and 18% respectively). The structure matrix for the discriminant functions is presented in Table 2. As can be seen from the centroids founds in Table 3, the first function differentiates the

presence/absence of a low involved speaker. Should a low involved speaker be involved in the conversation, there is greater recall of single fact thought units about the interlocutor and less recall of multiple fact thought units about the interlocutor. The second function differentiates the H-L dyadtype from the L-L and H-H dyadtypes. If the interaction is complementary (H-L), there is greater recall of single fact thought units about self. Classification analysis of the 30 conversations in the sample produced 80% accuracy.

Insofar as the discriminant analysis yielded the predicted discriminant structure, confirmation was obtained for the hypothesis that conversational recall is related to the use of dependent text-based conversational strategies. The first function strongly suggests that speakers with text-based strategies for relating to their interlocutor may not integrate the content of the interlocutor's utterances as much as speakers with meaning-based strategies. As such, they are listening for unrelated details rather than for patterns of meaning. The second function leads to a speculation that as the flow of conversation becomes less problematic in complementary interaction, the speakers become more confident about the conversation and remember more of their own comments. This view is almost diametrically opposed to the self-focus hypothesis insofar as it is assumed that negative feelings about the coherence of the conversation cause the speakers to focus more on the interlocutor and less on themselves. As the speakers mesh together more easily they become more attentive to the content of their own utterances.

Discourse strategy and listening in conversation

The experimental results obtained above coincide with prior research on the nature of interaction involvement insofar as high involved speakers appear to be more independent in their conversational behavior. They have distinct goals for a conversation and hence provide a sense of direction to the conversation. Low involved speakers, on the other hand, are less goal directed and show more dependence on their conversational partner. Furthermore, this dependence seems to be accentuated by a text-based discourse strategy which focuses on the specific

conversational text produced by the interlocutor. In summary, conversational recall was found to be sensitive to 1) text-based vs. meaning-based strategies in conversation and 2) complementary vs. symmetrical interaction as the joint manifestation of the interpersonal stances of both speakers.

Such experimental results strongly imply that listening in conversation is closely coordinated with strategies of speaking in conversation. Speakers seem to listen to their interlocutor for those aspects of conversational structure to which they can respond in a coherent and relevant fashion. For example, speakers who characteristically respond to the literal meaning of the interlocutor's last utterance would be expected to listen for the literal meaning of the interlocutor's last utterance with little attempt to integrate that meaning into a more comprehensive model of meaning for the interlocutor. Thus, listening research can be furthered by close attention to strategies of speaking in conversation. Every utterance in conversation reveals something of how the speaker has heard the conversation to that point.

As an illustration of this claim, the two variables found relevant to conversational recall will be used to analyze types of listeners in conversation. The thrust of the illustration is not to reveal any new types of listeners in conversation, but rather to show that these two variables can systematically account for relations among types of listeners already recognized. As similar research uncovers other such variables, a more comprehensive theoretical account of listening should become possible.

Insert Figure 1 here

Figure 1 presents a 2 x 2 matrix of four types of listeners in conversation. The listeners are differentiated with respect to 1) type of interpersonal stance, and 2) type of orientation to conversational text. For the purposes of illustration, interpersonal stance is explicated as independence or dependence. However, a number of relevant variables (e.g. locus of control, asser-

tiveness, Machiavellianism) could be substituted or incorporated here. Type of orientation to conversational text is explicated as meaning-based vs. text-based focus.

The first cell of Figure 1 represents the **Preoccupied Listener**. Such a listener may have a surplus of independent concerns and goals bidding for their attention. In conversation, the preoccupied listener may try to parcel out their attention between their interlocutor and various scripts running through their mind. With only limited attention available for the interlocutor, the preoccupied listener attends only to the surface words of the interlocutor. Obsession might illustrate chronic preoccupation; more likely though is temporary preoccupation in response to high stress, high job requirements, interpersonal conflict, etc.

The **Passive Listener** combines a dependent interpersonal stance with a text-based focus in conversation. Their basic strategy is to listen to the last surface item without attempting deeper integration of meaning across utterances. They exert little influence on the course of the conversation and they show minimal involvement. Passive listeners would not be expected to show extensive evaluation of or response to information shared in the conversation. Low involved subjects (Cegala, 1984; Villaume, 1984; Villaume & Cegala, 1986) constitute such passive listeners; the chronically lonely subjects whom Bell (1985) described as "passive, restrained communicators" (p. 231) would also probably fit this category.

Placid Listeners are dependent in their interpersonal stance but relate to conversational text by attending to deeper meanings. They are highly perceptive about what their interlocutor is saying and doing in the conversation. But they fail to respond in as complex a manner as they have perceived. Basically they are highly perceptive but nondirective processors. Assertiveness training may prove quite helpful in aiding placid listeners to become more active in conversation. However, it is possible that as placid listeners learn to develop their own utterances more actively they might actually lose some effectiveness as listeners.

The final cell of Figure 1 represents the **Active Listener**. This type of listener has independent personal goals and uses a meaning-based approach to encounter the goals of their interlo-

cutor. Text is interpreted complexly and the information derived is integrated into a more global pattern of response. The active listener also responds to information in a complex fashion by constructing complex utterances integrating information on a number of dimensions.

One intriguing aspect of such an analysis of listeners in the conversational setting is that listening strategies learned in conversation may be transferred to other listening settings where the strategies may become disfunctional. Although there is no direct evidence to support such a conjecture, it is reasonable to assume that listening is first learned and explored in the conversational setting. Overreliance on text-based processing in interpersonal listening may be quite difficult to set aside when listening in situations where engagement with the source is less immediate.

Conclusions

This paper has examined how social cognition affects the discourse strategies employed by conversants. It was argued that speakers face the demand to make coherent and relevant contributions to conversation. If a speaker finds it difficult to understand how the interlocutor is viewing the conversation, the speaker will also find it difficult to understand what would be a coherent and relevant contribution. The broad range of conversational resources available to a speaker allows the speaker to circumvent somewhat this problem. However, in doing so the speaker is assuming a characteristic discourse stance with regard to what the interlocutor says and a characteristic interpersonal stance with regard to what the interlocutor does. Finally, it was argued that the features of a speaker's chosen conversational strategy will also affect how the speaker listens and processes information in the conversation.

Such a theoretical approach is an alternative to excessive self-focus as an explanation of poor conversational recall. Conversational recall data associated with interaction involvement showed more empirical features consonant with the conversational strategy perspective proposed herein than with the excessive self-focus perspective. Type of orientation to text and

type of interpersonal stance were two variables characterizing a person's discourse strategy that were found to have an impact on how a person participated in conversation as both speaker and listener.

Research in how speakers manage the social cognitive demands of participating in conversation offers great potential as a major avenue of research in listening. The multifunctional and complex nature of every utterance allows the researcher insight into how the speaker has been hearing, interpreting, evaluating and retaining prior utterances in the conversation. As discourse analysts start to understand more of the process whereby various levels of conversational structure are coordinated, it should become possible to identify key features of conversation that are symptomatic of certain problems in listening. It is entirely conceivable that listening consultants in the future might record and analyze the conversational behavior of a client in order to diagnose the listening problems of the client.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J.R. (1983). A spreading activation theory of memory. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 22, 261-295.

Bell, R.A. (1985). Conversational involvement and loneliness. Communication Monographs, 52, 218-235.

Bell, R.A. & Daly, J.A. (1985). Some communicator correlates of loneliness. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 50, 121-142.

Cegala, D.J. (1984). Affective and cognitive manifestations of interaction involvement during unstructured and competitive interactions. Communication Monographs, 51, 320-338.

Cegala, D.J., Savage, G.T., Brunner, C.C., & Conrad, A.B. (1982). An elaboration of the meaning of interaction involvement: Toward the development of a theoretical concept. Communication Monographs, 49, 229-248.

Cegala, D.J., Wall, V.D., & Rippey, G. (1986). A study of perceived communication behaviors of high- and low-involved persons in task-oriented groups. An unpublished manuscript. The Ohio State University.

Craig, R.T. & Tracy, K. (Eds.). (1983). Conversational coherence: Form, structure, and strategy. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Craik, F. (1973). A levels of analysis view of memory. In P.Pliner, L.Krames, & T. Alloway (Eds.), Communication and affect: Language and thought. New York: Academic Press.

Craik, F. & Lockhart, R. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 2, 671-684.

Delia, J.G. (1984). Recent developments in social cognition and interpersonal behavior: A consolidation and extension. In H.E. Sypher & J.L. Applegate (Eds.), Communication by children and adults: Social cognitive and Strategic processes. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 313-321.

Hasan, R. (1984). Coherence and cohesive harmony. In J. Flood (Ed.), Understanding reading comprehension: Cognition, language, and the structure of prose. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.

Housel, T.J. (1984). Analyzing conversations: Context, content, inference, and structure. In H.E. Sypher & J.L. Applegate (Eds.), Communication by children and adults: Social cognitive and Strategic processes. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 211-230.

McLaughlin, M.L. (1984). Conversation: How talk is organized. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Ragan, S.L. (1983). Alignment and conversational coherence. In R.T. Craig & K. Tracy (Eds.), Conversational coherence: Form, structure, and strategy. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Stafford, L. & Daly, J.A. (1984). Conversational memory: The effects of recall mode and memory expectancies on remembrances of natural conversations. Human Communication Research, 10, 379-402.

Steil, L.K., Barker, L.L. & Watson, K.W. (1983). Effective listening: Key to your success. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Villaume, W.A. (1984). Patterns of coherence in the conversation of high and low involved speakers. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Villaume, W.A. & Cegala, D.J. (1986). Interaction involvement and discourse strategies: The patterned usage of cohesive devices in conversation. Unpublished manuscript. Auburn University.

TABLE 1

Summary Statistics of Discriminant Functions
for Dyadtype Using Style Variables

Discriminant Function	Canonical R	Wilk's Lambda	X^2	df	p
1	0.672	0.451	20.71	6	.002
2	0.419	0.824	5.04	2	.080

TABLE 2

Structure Coefficients between Discriminant Functions
and Recall Variables

Variable	Structure Coefficients	
	Function 1	Function 2
Single fact units of other	.683	.641
Multiple fact units of other	-.406	.192
Single fact units of self	.027	-.965

TABLE 3

Group Centroids in the Discriminant Space for Dyadtype

Dyadtype	Function 1	Function 2
High-High	-1.219	-.028
High-Low	.561	.551
Low-Low	.657	-.523

Discourse Orientation	Interpersonal Stance: Independent	Interpersonal Stance: Dependent
Text-based	Preoccupied Listener	Passive Listener
Meaning-based	Active Listener	Placid Listener

Figure 2: Types of Listeners in Conversation